THERMAL ANALYSIS OF SCRF CAVITY COUPLERS USING PARALLEL MULTIPHYSICS TOOL TEM3P*

V. Akcelik, L-Q. Lee, Z. Li, C-K. Ng, and K. Ko (SLAC, Menlo Park, CA, USA)
G. Cheng, R. Rimmler, H. Wang (Jefferson Lab, Newport News, VA, USA)

Abstract

SLAC has developed a multi-physics simulation code TEM3P for simulating integrated effects of electromagnetic, thermal and structural effects. TEM3P shares the same software infrastructure with SLAC's paralell finite element electromagnetic codes, thus enabling all physics simulations within a single framework. The finite-element approach allows high-fidelity, high-accuracy simulations and the parallel implementation facilitates large-scale computation with fast turnaround times. In this paper, TEM3P is used to analyze thermal loading at coupler end of the JLAB SCRF cavity.

INTRODUCTION

In the design of the next generation accelerators, optimizing the performance and cost effectiveness of RF cavities require precise thermal and mechanical analyses along with accurate electromagnetic (EM) design. Many failures in accelerator operations are caused by excessive heating arising from high power or high current operations. Presently, EM, thermal and mechanical calculations are carried out separately with different modeling tools. It is important in the accelerator community to build an integrated modeling package with capabilities of EM, thermal, and mechanical modeling using the same data structure.

Under the support of the U.S. SCIDAC program, SLAC has been developing high fidelity 3D parallel finite element codes for the design of next generation particle accelerators [1]. Recently we have developed a multi-physics simulation tool, TEM3P, for the design and analysis of thermal, structural and electromagnetic effects such as cavity wall heating, structural deformations, and Lorentz force detuning simulations [2]. TEM3P shares the same finite element code infrastructure with the existing EM finite-element codes developed at SLAC, and enables all multi-physics calculations to be done in a single framework, and provides a complete toolset for engineering prototyping. The new solvers for thermal and mechanical simulations have been implemented, tested and validated independently against the commercial package ANSYS [3]. The parallel implementation of TEM3P allows large-scale computations on massively parallel supercomputers so that high-fidelity and high-accuracy simulations can be performed with a fast turnaround time.

In the following, we perform multi-physics study of the SCRF cavity couplers including electromagnetic and thermal analyses.

THERMAL ANALYSIS OF JLAB HCCM CAVITY

Thermal analysis of JLAB HCCM cavity has two main computational challenges. The first is extreme large scale. This is due to the need to resolve very small features of cavity walls and couplers. A typical finite element discretization ends up with millions of degrees of freedom. Single processor simulations may limit simulations accuracy to details due to both memory requirements, and slow turnaround time. Thermal simulation of HCCM cavity with single processors may take days to converge. A fast turnaround time is essential for the design of accelerator cavities, since design process may require many simulations. The second computational challenge is nonlinearity. Thermal simulations of superconducting cavities are highly nonlinear due to temperature dependent thermal conductivity, surface resistance and Kapitza conductance. Solving nonlinear thermal equation requires efficient and robust nonlinear solvers. TEM3P addresses both of these challenges through parallel implementation of an inexact Newton method.

For the JLAB HCCM cavity, the surface magnetic fields of the accelerating mode produce heating on the cavity walls. This heating, if not properly dissipated, cavity quench may result in excessive power requirement. The multi-physics simulation for HCCM cavity is done in two steps

- Electromagnetic simulation for the vacuum region.
- Thermal simulation for the cavity metal body.

These two steps are performed in sequence. The result of EM simulation is used as input for the thermal simulation. The analysis starts from a CAD model of JLAB HCCM cavity shown in Fig. 1. The second order finite element meshes are generated using CUBIT [4] for the vacuum and metal body region of the cavity. The EM simulation will be applied to the vacuum region of the mesh and the thermal analysis will be applied to the metal region of the mesh. The two regions share the same common surface mesh at the interface, so that data can be transferred directly between two analyses.

*Work supported by the U.S. DOE ASCR, BES, and HEP Divisions under contract No. DE-AC02-76SF00515. This research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center and the National Center for Computational Sciences at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which are supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231 and DE-AC05-00OR22725, respectively.



Figure 1: The CAD model of JLAB SCRF cavity including metal and vacuum region.

Electromagnetic analysis is performed using Omega3P. The mesh for the vacuum region has 113K elements. The cavity wall is assumed perfect conductor. Using second order FEM discretization, the resulting accelerating frequency is 1.497 GHz, and electric field distribution is shown in Fig. 2.



Figure 2: Electric field distribution for the accelerating mode..

The heat source for the thermal simulation is the thermal loss of the accelerating mode at the cavity wall. The heating power P_S is calculated using perturbation method

$$P_S = \frac{1}{2} \int_G H^2 R_S dG \tag{1}$$

Where R_S is the surface resistance, and G is the surface boundary between the vacuum region and the metal part. The magnetic field is scaled to effective gradient of 20 MV/m. The power loss computed with Eq(1) is applied as heat flux load to the RF surface of the metal body of the cavity. In Eq(1), the surface resistance depends on material type. For HCCM cavity, the surface between EM field and metallic part is made of different materials such as copper, stainless steel, and Nb-Ti alloy. All these materials have temperature dependent surface resistance properties, their values vary significantly.

The metal part of cavity is comprised of copper, stainless steel, Nb, Nb-Ti alloy and AlMg. HOM waveguide part is made of stainless steel. The heating surface of HOM waveguide is covered with very thin copper coating with 5 μm thickness. The coating has smaller surface resistance than stainless steel, and decreases the heating caused by EM fields. In addition copper also has larger thermal conductivity than stainless steel. The coating can not be modeled with volume elements such as tetrahedron due to very small thickness. TEM3P uses shell elements for FEM modeling of very thin layers.



Figure 3: Temperature field caused by EM heating.

Thermal conductivities of metallic part vary for different parts and with temperature. For example at 2.1K temperature, the thermal conductivity of stainless steel is 0.11 $Wm^{-1}K^{-1}$, and at the same temperature for copper is 66.2 $Wm^{-1}K^{-1}$, and for stainless steel the thermal conductivity at 300 K is 66.2 $Wm^{-1}K^{-1}$ [5].

Cooling of part of the waveguide is performed by liquid Helium, and modeled as Kapitza conductance [6]. The bulk temperature for Helium is at 2.07 K at Nb-Ti flange, and 2.1 K at cooling channel of HOM waveguide. The liquid Helium convective film coefficient is also temperature dependent.

In addition to RF heating boundary condition and Kapitza conductance, the temperature at the end of HOM coupler is set to 300K. There is also a 50 K heat station at HOM waveguide. The rest of the boundaries are modeled as natural convection.

Due to strong nonlinearity, care must be taken in the solution of nonlinear thermal equation. TEM3P uses Newton method for solving the nonlinear equation. It is known that Newton method needs robust implementation for strongly nonlinear problems. We use an inexact Newton method for solving the nonlinear equations [7]. Each nonlinear equation requires solution of linear system of equations. The resulted linear equations are solved using iterative preconditioned Krylov space methods, such as GMRES.



Figure 4: Temperature field around AlMg seal.

Result of the thermal simulation using second order FEM discretization is shown in Figure 3. Temperature field changes between 2.07K and 300K as expected. An important part for thermal analysis is the region around AlMg seal. Temperature distribution for this part is shown in Fig. 4.

CONVERGENCE STUDIES

To perform convergence studies we use two meshes with different mesh sizes. The fist one has 1.35 M (coarse mesh) tetrahedron elements, and the second one has 4.3 M (fine mesh) tetrahedron elements. Thermal simulations are performed with both linear and quadratic discretizations. The results are plotted and compared along a line (Fig. 5). Numerical results indicate that, the simulations converge with quadratic finite element discretization.

The largest simulation has 7.07 M dof's, and uses 256 processor (on NERSC's Franklin), and converges in 25 minutes, with 12 nonlinear iterations.



Figure 5: Temperature along a line using different meshes, and FEM discretization.

SUMMARY

TEM3P is a parallel multi-physics tool including integrated electromagnetic, thermal and structural effects, allows accurate and fast analysis for cavity design and performance. Nonlinear problems such as that arising from convective cooling at cavity surface are solved efficiently. Further code verification and validation will be carried out for the SCRF cavity in collaboration with JLAB scientists.

REFERENCES

[1] Z. Li et al., "Towards Simulations of Electromagnetic and Beam Physics at the Petascale", Proc. PAC2007, Albuquerque, New Mexico, June 25-29, 2007.

[2] V. Akcelik et al., "Parallel Computation of Integrated Electromagnetic, Thermal and Structural Effects for Accelerator Cavities", Proc. EPAC08, Genoa, Italy, June 23-27, 2008.

[3] http:://www.ansys.com.

[4] http://cubit.sandia.gov.

[5] http::/cryogenics.nist.gov

[6] S. W. Van Sciver, "Helium Cryogenics", 1986

[7] S. C. Eisenstat and H. F. Walker, "Choosing the Forcing Terms in Inexact Newton Method", SIAM J. Sci. Comput.,Vol 17, No 1, pp 16-32, 1996.