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I. INTRODUCTION

In 1969 the Van de Graaff Saturne injector was replaced by a 20-MeV Linac fed by a pressurized pre-injector. (Proceedings of the 1970 International Conference on Linear Accelerators, N.A.L. Batavia, U.S.A.)

In 1970 we started to fill operation sheets for the main equipment of the synchrotron.

We shall here report on the results of a statistical study based on the modern theories of reliability and dealing with the frequency and the repartition of failures on the one hand, and with the frequency and the repartition of the duration of the said failures on the other hand.

In the following we shall refer to "Preinjector" for all failures concerning the preinjector itself or the low energy optical system whatever the origin of the failure: high voltage technology, ion source, vacuum system, interlock system, and beam controls and steering.

Failures will be taken into account only when they lead to the cutting off of the beam for Physics experiments.

In the same manner, the "Linac" denomination will cover failures from both the accelerator and the high-energy optical system, with different possible origins: the rf power supply (200 MHz, 2 MW), the vacuum system, the interlock system, beam controls and steering, and rf sparking in the cavity.

II. METHOD USED TO OBTAIN OPERATION STATISTICS

Let us consider a \( \Delta t_0 \) time of operation of the Linac, then a \( \Delta t_f \) time of failure (including time for repairing the failure) then a new \( \Delta t_0 \) operation and so on (refer to figure below).

\[
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\Delta t_0 & \quad \Delta t_f & \quad \Delta t_0 \\
0 & \quad \Delta t_0 & \quad \Delta t_f & \quad \Delta t_0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

where,

\( n_{10} \) is the exact number of intervals of good operation, \( \Delta t_{10} \), counted along the considered period of time, and

\( n_{1f} \) is the exact number of failures with a duration, \( \Delta t_{1f} \), counted along the same period of time.

One may write:

\[
\sum n_{1f} \cdot \Delta t_{1f} + \sum n_{10} \cdot \Delta t_{10} = T_m \quad \text{total duration of the failures}
\]

\[
\sum n_{10} \cdot \Delta t_{10} \neq T_m \quad \text{total machine time.}
\]

However, \( \sum n_{1f} \cdot \Delta t_{1f} \) is of the order of 100 hours and negligible with respect to \( \sum n_{10} \cdot \Delta t_{10} > 3000 \) hours.

Therefore, \( \sum n_{10} \cdot \Delta t_{10} \neq T_m \).

Besides, \( \sum n_{10} = \sum n_{1f} = N \).

The probability to have an interval of operation greater than a given \( \Delta t_{k0} \) is:

\[
R = 1 - \frac{k^{n_{1f}}}{N} = \text{Probability} \{ \Delta t_0 > \Delta t_{k0} \}
\]
which is the reliability of the system expressed in percentage.

In the same manner, one can define for the failures:

\[ M = 1 - \frac{\sum_{k} p_{nf}}{N} = \text{Probability } \{ \Delta t_{\xi} > \Delta t_{kf} \} \]

The two functions of repartition may be plotted as follows: (see a and b in next column).

In semi-log plotting we generally get straight lines or series of straight lines, which means that the repartition functions are exponentials or series of exponentials.

It is then possible to compute the values of the constants that characterize the different types of operation or the durations of the failures \((\lambda_1, \lambda_1', \lambda_2, \text{ or } \mu_1, \mu_2)\). (See c and d in next column.)

The availability of the system is calculated from the slopes of these two curves. In fact these data do not describe any more the probability to get a failure after a \(\Delta t_o\) interval, or a failure duration greater than \(\Delta t_f\); but, considering these two probabilities, it expresses the probability to be in either condition at a given time counted from the zero time when the system is started.

The probability to be still in operation at time \(t\) is:

\[ P_o = \frac{\mu}{\mu + \lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{\mu + \lambda} e^{-(\lambda + \mu)t} \]

This includes the possibility to have had previous failures that have been repaired. The probability to be in the condition of failure at time \(t\) is:

\[ P_f = 1 - P_o \]

\[ P_f = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \mu} \left( 1 - e^{-(\lambda + \mu)t} \right), \]

where

\[ P_o \] is the availability of the system at time \(t\), and

\[ P_f \] is the unavailability of the system at time \(t\).
III. RESULTS WITH THE SATURNE INJECTOR

The results obtained from the operation sheets are described by the following figures:

1 - 1970 Linac operation scattergramm
2 - 1971 Linac operation scattergramm
3 - 1972 Linac operation scattergramm
5 - 1970 Linac failure scattergramm
6 - 1971 Linac failure scattergramm
7 - 1972 Linac failure scattergramm
9 - 1970 Pre-injector operation scattergramm
10 - 1971 Pre-injector operation scattergramm
11 - 1972 Pre-injector operation scattergramm
13 - 1970 Pre-injector failure scattergramm
14 - 1971 Pre-injector failure scattergramm
15 - 1972 Pre-injector failure scattergramm

From these curves we can, by use of the preceding formulas, find out the values of the essential data. They can be found in Table I.

The mean times of stabilization ($1/\lambda_{\text{average}}$) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linac</th>
<th>Pre-injector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. GENERAL REMARKS

The examination of the curves brings out the following remarks:

A. Linac

1. Operation (Figure 4)
   a. 80% of the operation durations are shorter than 12 hours. If, from 1970 to 1971, the situation could be considered as stationary, an effect of fatigue of the equipment can be noticed in 1972.
   
   One must also remember that in 1972 the time allowed to the maintenance of the equipment has been reduced due to the necessity to install new equipment (deuteron injection with ramping of the energy).
   b. The probability to operate for more than one day is 10%.
   c. The probability to operate for more than 5 days is about 1%.

2. Duration of failures (Figure 8)
   a. 80% of the failure durations are shorter than 15 minutes. From this point of view the situation is fairly stable since 1970, and one may say that the typical mode of operation is: 10 hours of operation; 15 minutes of failure.

   These failures are generally due to the rf equipment (crow-bars) or to sparking in the cavity when deuterons are accelerated, which requires a higher field in the first gaps of the Linac to compensate for the poor transit time factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1/\lambda$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1/u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_O$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_o$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_f$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The probability to get a failure duration longer than 30 minutes is 10%.

c. The probability to get a failure duration longer than 4 hours is 1%.

One can also remark that the availability is $P_0 = 98\%$. In spite of a rather short typical operation duration, and on the account of fast repairing, the Linac is, on the average, of good availability.

B. Preinjector

1. Operation (Figure 12)

a. The probability to operate for less than one day without failure is 40%.

b. The probability to operate for more than 7 days is 10%.

c. The probability to operate as follows is 1%: 1970, for more than 15 days; 1971, for more than 23 days; and 1972, for more than 30 days.

Clearly, improvements have been obtained from one year to another.

2. Duration of failures (Figure 16)

a. The probability to have a failure duration shorter than 15 minutes is 75%.

b. The 10% probability of failure applies as follows: 1970, duration > 3 hours; 1971, duration > 2 hours; and 1972, duration > 4.5 hours.

c. Failures of long duration have been more important in 1970 and 1972 than in 1971.

The typical mode of operation is more difficult to release, it is something like: one day of operation; 30 minutes of failure.

The availability is still high, a precise computation gives a 98% value.

Most failures are of short duration, they are mainly due to filling of liquid nitrogen traps and interlocking systems.

Failures with long durations are due to changes of cathodes and of the focusing tube. The technique of pressurized vessel evidently leads to longer repairing times, which are, however, compensated by the advantages of much higher dielectric strengths. We could also discover an erosion of the environment during repairing activities which often leads to the necessity of a new intervention a few days later. The installation of new equipment or modification of existing equipment also leads to similar results, that is, the erosion of the general system capability (defects in contacts, elements of the interlock system running out of service...).
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