

# Opening the Endcaps at the IP(?)

Karsten Buesser





ILD Workshop

Paris

27.01.2010

# Opening on the Beam (- or not)?

- Present design foresees opening of the detector on the beam:
  - Partially split endcap yoke allows  $\sim 1$  m wide access space between coil and endcap calorimeters
  - Allows for limited maintenance in the beam position(?)
  - Every major work would be done in the parking position - push pull!
- But:
  - A real engineering challenge which puts hard boundary conditions on many other things



CMS Experience: it is not trivial to access a 1m wide space several meters above the floor (beam height is at 9m).



➤ Small size cradle elevator ( used for small interventions) :


Needed place between endcap and barrel : 1.6 m

The overall size on floor of engine is 1.3 m


➤ Crane truck ( allowing heavier operation up to  $\approx$ full height) :

1.5 m on floor, 2 m needed for motion

+ On surface :  
Scaffolding  
Fixed and  
moveable





- Movable yoke endcap makes QD0 support complicated
- QD0 supported by pillar outside of the detector and suspended on tie rods from the cryostat
- Monitored by MONALISA, placed on actuators for alignment
- Vibration issues are under study
- Alternative QD0 support ideas are under study



- MONALISA requires vacuum pipes for laser beams attached to QD0
- Need to be disconnected remotely controlled when the endcap is opened
- Needs a lot of engineering work

Case of Monalisa :  
Final Doublet Stability and in-detector  
Interferometry


- 4 entries on one side,
- 2 on the other side,
- Lines going under the detector



- It is an interferometric metrology system for continuous monitoring of position critical accelerator components
- Consists of a fixed network of evacuated interferometric distance meters with nanometre type resolutions over  $O(10m)$

See David Urner's talk at LCSW08

- Endcap deformations are in the order of 15mm
  - Will be better at ILD
- Ground deformations during movements can reach 5mm at a scale of 2m.
- Time for closing of the endcap is in the order of 1.5 days (sic!)
  - Has not been done very often so far. Learning-curve effects are expected
- Moving 3000t pieces in a delicate environment (beam pipe is 1mm) is not trivial and needs thorough engineering



- From the engineering point of view it would be much simpler to do maintenance on the detector only in the parking position
  - Push-pull will bring the detector to the parking position in one day
- Question to all of us:
  - **What do we really gain if we design the detector for the opening of the end-cap on the beam?**
- Keep in mind:
  - Access space is VERY limited
  - Only limited access to TPC endplate, barrel and endcap calorimeters
  - No access to inner detector (VTX, SIT, FTD, etc.)
  - CMS experience: opening time for the endcaps could be in the order of one day.
  - „When people are moving heavy pieces in these conditions (...), they become extra careful as any accident has dramatic implications.“ (A. Hervé)
  - Engineering resources are EXTREMELY rare in ILD. If we spend many on the endcap we might miss them somewhere else
- Questions to be answered:
  - What maintenance could be done on your subdetector during this limited access?
  - How much luminosity would we lose if we wait with the maintenance until we pull out?
  - What is the lumi-loss risk with the more complicated opening scenario?

- Comments received so far:
  - „Keep it simple, we can get more sophisticated when the machine has been approved.“
  - „Think about the potential problems now so that they will not hit us later“
  - „Do not mix maintenance procedures with push-pull issues. Maintenance is ILD-internal, while push-pull involves the other detector as well.“
  
- What is your opinion?