

Survey - meeting J.P.Quesnel, C.Fischer and JBJ

- rms survey default
 - t = 0: $\sigma = 150 \ \mu \text{m}$, truncated at 2σ
 - $t=1~{\rm yr}$: $\sigma=200~\mu{\rm m},$ truncated at 2σ ?
- This relatively to a ref.line drawn between quads
- This also for standard ajustment tools (which can react,...)
- Tunel movements shall not induce significant angular misalignment
- IR3 and IR7 both very quiet (less movement than average)

Collimators

• If the mechanics allows soft adjustments, we can hope for better values



- JPQ commented on radiation levels: mounting tables for alignment in the lab and adequate structure in the tunnel required to allow straight interchange
 - \Rightarrow impact on mechanical design

Collimators and collective effects

Preliminary discussion : D. Brandt, L. Vos and BJ

- a tapering is needed because of longitunal instabilities related to the rather weak RF voltage in LHC 91-100mm at each end (for tank inner height 50mm)
- ⇒ consequence for layout (bj, to be reviewed when more other studies done
- unless the distance between the jaw and the wall of the tank is very small (what is 'small', to be discussed. Gerard to make an offer?), a RF contact will be needed all along the jaw).
- Daniel an Luc also noticed the presence of a vacuum port at each end of a collimator. To be reevaluated vac. port on the tank?
- Luc suggested getter coating to simplify vacuum
- Further iteration needed with more people

Thermal Studies

Preliminary discussion : Tadeusz Kurtyka, R. Valbuena and BJ

- They would much prefer the thermal calculations to be under their control, with input from us (CERN+IHEP)
- No staff inside CERN
- But good and inexpensive collaboration with Cracow and ENS-Cachan
- Time-scale (their views):
 - Collimator construction $\sim 2~{\rm years}$
 - \Rightarrow No need to do thermal studies+design as early as next June
 - Agreed/proposed for a further meeting with BI on this