



### Report on experimental results for metal-ion beams Report: JRA01-ARES-MS84

- 1) Oven development
- 2) Sputter development
- 3) MIVOC development
- 4) Hot liner
- 5) New innovations
- 6) Production efficiency with different methods





Deliverable D7.3 WP7-JRA01-ARES

### Foil oven:

The original plan was to have tests with the movable oven. This plan was cancelled after the demagnetized permanent magnets (radial sputtering experiments). The reason can be seen from figure (oven very close to the permanent magnets as soon as it is inserted into the plasma chamber).



This part was removed to make movable axial sputtering possible





Port for foil oven







Deliverable D7.3 WP7- JRA01 - ARES



## MoO<sub>3</sub> with oven

- MoO<sub>3</sub> has the vapor pressure of 1 mbar at 800°C
- Has several isotopes (<sup>92</sup>Mo: 14.84 %, <sup>94</sup>Mo: 9.25 %, <sup>95</sup>Mo: 15.92 %, <sup>96</sup>Mo: 16.68 %, <sup>97</sup>Mo: 9.55 %, <sup>98</sup>Mo: 24.13 %, <sup>100</sup>Mo: 9.63 %)

EU classification Carc. Cat. 3 Harmful (**Xn**) Irritant (**Xi**)

H. Kojvisto, JYFL, 9th Oct.2012



Deliverable D7.3

WP7– JRA01 – ARES



Oven experiments at GANIL:

- Oven capable of covering evaporation temperatures from Ca to Ni
- Movable (any tests?)
- Strong heating by RF/plasma. Limiting the performance for high charge state Ca beams (Ca<sup>16+</sup>)
- He vs O<sub>2</sub> vs N<sub>2</sub> has negligible effect on total ionization efficiency (which is ≈ 5 %)



FIG. 2. Best spectrum optimized on  $^{58}\rm{Ni}^{19+}$  (20  $\mu\rm{A}$ ). RF power: 1.7 kW, oven position : 0 mm, oven electrical power: 71 W (oven temperature 1450°C off line), biased disk: –36 V / 0.5 mA, extraction : 40 kV / 4.7 mA, coils current: 1130 A / –1180 A / 1290 A, FC slits : 10 mm, extraction: 1.4  $10^{-8}$  mbar.







New design: Intensities were lower than earlier (Ti<sup>11+</sup> :  $\approx 20 \ \mu A \rightarrow$  less than 10  $\mu A$ ). This indicates that we have had sputtering + heating. The question comes up: can we arrange this resonant heating safely?





H. Koivisto, JYFL, 9th Oct.2012





Deliverable D7.3 WP7-JRA01-ARES

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

## Axial sputtering

Version 2: we were able to get up to 0.5 µA of Zr<sup>12+</sup> beam. During the short time we see more (close to 2 µA) but we were not able to get it back. The intensity is far behind the requested (≈ 20 µA).

|                     | Poistion [mm] | Sputter voltage [kV] | Sputter current [mA] |
|---------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Zero level          | -10           | 3                    | 0.21                 |
| corresponds to      | -20           | 3                    | 0.45                 |
| inner surface of nc | -20           | 4                    | 0.52                 |
|                     | -40           | 4                    | 1.04                 |

Typical sputter voltage in the case of radial sputtering is 1-2 kV

- > The insertion had a big effect as is seen from the current of sputter voltage.
- We should have enough sputtering (sputter current high enough)
- Conclusion: sputter products do not reach the plasma.



Deliverable D7.3 WP7-JRA01 - ARES



# Axial sputtering



More axial sputtering experiments were performed at ATOMKI: Results:  $Au^{20+}$ : 1 µA (very stable,  $O_2$  buffer)  $Ca^{8+}$ : 2 µA Si<sup>5+</sup>: 2 µA

This looks more promising!! Has to be on plasma flux area? Closer to plasma? More experiments have to be performed.





|     | Isotope/charge         | 8+   | 9+   | 10+  | 11+  | •          |
|-----|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------------|
|     | <sup>46</sup> Ti 7.9%  | 3.6* | 4.7* | 4.8* | 4.8* | MARK BOARD |
|     | <sup>47</sup> Ti 7.3%  | 3.3* | 4.3* | 4.4* | 4.4* |            |
|     | <sup>48</sup> Ti 73.9% | 33   | 43   | 44   | 45   |            |
|     | <sup>49</sup> Ti 5.5%  | 2.5* | 3.2* | 3.3* | 3.3* |            |
| -// | <sup>50</sup> Ti 5.3%  | 2.5* | 3.2* | 3.3* | 3.3* |            |



Deliverable D7.3

WP7– JRA01 – ARES



### <sup>50</sup>Titanium beam production at **JYFL** with the ECRIS2 ion source <sup>50</sup>Ti<sup>q+</sup> 9+ 10+ 11+ 12+ $\blacktriangleright$ Using C<sub>5</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>5</sub>**Ti**(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> Ι [μΑ] 14.9 16.8 19.4 14.8 ➢ <sup>50</sup>Ti<sup>11+</sup> beam of 15-20 µA Nuclear physics experiment of several weeks October, 2013 HF : 320 W MIVOC : 300 mbar.L/s ζ4+ : 110 μA 9+ С5+ : 20 µА Н\_+ : 100 µА **10+** 20 µA <sup>50</sup>Titanium beam production 100 11 C3+ at GANIL with the ECR4 ion 11+ 130 µA 6source C2 $\succ$ Using C<sub>5</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>5</sub>**Ti**(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> C1 12+ ➢ <sup>50</sup>Ti<sup>10+</sup> beam of 10-25 µA 5-Nuclear physics 13experiment of 15 days ANI Successful synthesis of Ti compound makes the Ti isotopes of 46, 47 and 49 available. H. Koivisto, JYFL, 9th Oct.2012



Deliverable D7.3 WP7-JRA01 - ARES



4) Hot liner R & D

### Hot liner at GSI:

- Passively heated by plasma
- Works nicely for Ca
- Production efficiency similar to gases was reached: 13 % for Ca<sup>10+</sup>, overall efficiency > 40 % (measured after dipole)
- Long term stability





time (h) H. Koivesto, JYFL, 9th Oct.2012





## Hot liner at **GANIL**: ≻ ??







Deliverable D7.3

WP7-JRA01-ARES



### Hot liner at **INFN**:

- > Temperature distribution of liner as a function of microwave power was simulated
- > Ca consumption rate decreased  $\approx 40 \%$



H. Kojvisto, JYFL, 9th Oct.2012





### 5) New innovations

Production of sputter target from elements available in powder form (especially for refractory elements)









## 6) Production efficiency with different methods

MIVOC method has much higher production efficiency than oven method (JYFL miniature oven):

- Gaseous form (at RT) not condensation on the walls
- Capture of slow molecule (by plasma) might be more efficient



