

RADECS Thematic Workshop on European Accelerators

Test Experiences and Needs

Renaud Mangeret, Daniel Peyre, Christian Binois



Françoise Bezerra



Ronan Marec

Thierry Carrière



Given at Jyväskylä, Finland, May 26th, 2005

Outline

- **Technical needs regarding test facilities**
 - Set up
 - Ion characteristics
 - Validation of test conditions
- **Schedule and geographical consideration**
 - Availability
 - Access
- **Outputs of test campaign**
 - Test results analysis
- **Conclusions**



Technical needs regarding test facilities : test setup - 1/3

- Size of the vacuum chamber big enough to easily install the setup
- Availability of numerous reliable vacuum pipes/connectors that may be used in parallel
 - BNC, DB25, HE40, SMA
 - Possibility to have specific pipes implemented on request
- Availability of 3 axes positioning system for test board
 - Possibility to increase the usable size of the test board up to A4 paper sheet



Technical needs regarding test facilities : test setup - 2/3

- Available flux from about 100 to $5 \cdot 10^4$ particle/cm².s
 - Stability of the flux monitored whatever the value is
 - Possibility to modify the flux during a run
- Beam size ideally to be extended up to a diameter of about 5 cm
- To optimise experimental duration
 - Possibility of a quick ion change (< 15 minutes)
 - To optimise switch time air/vacuum/air and access time to chamber



Technical needs regarding test facilities : test setup - 3/3

- **Temperature aspects**
 - Need of a cooling system allowing heat dissipation when testing power devices
 - Possibility to perform testing at different temperatures
- **Implementation of optical assistance setup**
 - Camera targeting the device under test / ion beam
 - Laser beam for precise localisation of heavy ion beam
- **Possibility for experimental measurement setup to be located near the chamber (ideally 1 to 2 meters)**
- **Need for a shutter with a reaction time < 10 ms**



Technical needs regarding test facilities : ions characteristics

- **Range of ions**

- To be at least 40 to 50 μm whatever the LET is
- Ideally to have access to range representative of space ion population (to be discussed during Round Table 2)
 - Range likely to be extended above 100 μm

- **Available LET value at minimum from 0 to 60 $\text{MeV}\cdot\text{cm}^2/\text{mg}$**

- Ideally to have access to LET range representative of space ion population (to be discussed during Round Table 2)
- Amount of available LET value to be increased
 - LET values distributed across the overall LET range,
 - 7 different LET attainable sounds like a good number



Technical needs regarding test facilities : validation of the test conditions - 1/2

- Before the test

- On line availability of technical characteristics of the test facility
 - Flux and LET range, beam size, beam homogeneity, ion species (with associated uncertainty whenever applicable)...
 - Calculation methodology regarding LET values
 - Radioprotection requirements
- Use of SEE test monitor (see “Design and Test of a Reference SEU Monitor” presentation)



Technical needs regarding test facilities : validation of the test conditions - 2/2

- After the test

- Availability of information regarding each run
 - Flux and fluence measurement with associated precision
 - Ion specie used together with its energy, range, LET
 - Run duration, deposited dose
 - Activation status



Schedule and geographical aspects : general considerations - 1/2

- To homogenise / centralise accelerator availability across Europe
 - To have on line real time access (internet/other) about available slots on the different European accelerators
 - Once on line/e-mail reservation is performed by user, quick validation of chosen slot needed (typ. 72 hours) from test facility
 - Reservation process based on first in – first out principle
 - Availability of test slots uniformly spread over the year



Schedule and geographical aspects : general considerations - 2/2

- Accelerator location

- Since experimental work is very often performed at night, need for cosy & warm office for test team, associated with efficient coffee machine...
- Need for standard small materials (soldering tool,...)
- Need for hotel arrangement very close from test facility
- Location easily accessible (plane, train, camel, pirogue...)





Outputs of SEE test campaign - 1/2

- Having a SEE test result is good... but not sufficient
- To update specification/requirements for SEE test report validation
 - To define the mandatory information to be placed in a SEE test report according to state of the art
 - To provide with guide lines regarding test consistency determination (See next slide)
 - To precise applicability domain of the SEE test results
- To state about the usage of SEE rate prediction tools (example : SIMPA, PROFIT)
 - Possibly associated with recommendations for use



Outputs of SEE test campaign - 2/2

- Example: test results during proton testing at one energy

Run	Part number	Fluence	Nb event	Sigma
1	1	$3 \cdot 10^{11}$	1	$3.4 \cdot 10^{-12}$
2	2	$3 \cdot 10^{11}$	1	
3	3	$3 \cdot 10^{11}$	1	
4	4	10^{11}	7	$7 \cdot 10^{-11}$
5	4	10^{11}	1	10^{-11}
	mean	$1.1 \cdot 10^{12}$	11	10^{-11}



Classical analysis deals only with mean results and leads to wrong result:

$$\sigma < \left[\sigma_{\text{mean}} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{N_{\text{event}}}} \right) = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-11} \right] < 7 \cdot 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^2$$

Need of statistical tools to verify the consistency between runs, to help to the decision (exclude run, retest...) and to define reliable cross section

Conclusions

- SEE testing should mimic at best flight conditions in coherence with industrial needs in terms of
 - Technical outputs
 - Cost
 - Schedule
- By doing such, we optimise risk analysis regarding SEE assessment.

