## Results of precise magnetic calibrations at the facilities of IG, CAS

**Michal Janosek** 

Dept. of Measurement, FEE, Czech Tech. Univ. Prague

"MAGLAB"

## MAGLAB @ CTU FEE competence

### • Fluxgate sensors & magnetometers

- FGS: low noise vectorial mg. field sensors
- Magnetic materials selection and treatment
- Sensor construction & characterization
- <u>Magnetometer construction & calibration</u>



- Induction coils 10 Hz 100 kHz
- **Custom electronics** for commercial sensors (Hall, AMR, GMR..)





Petrucha, Azpurua, Janosek; IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas. - 2015

## Magnetometer calibration

### • Triaxial sensor heads

- 9 parameters (gain, offset, orthogonality error)

#### Vectorial calibration

- Pre-defined field generated in calibrated coils
- OL precise control of coil current or CL precise sensor
- Direct measurements or non-linear optimization

### Scalar calibration

- Homogeneous (Earth's) magnetic field
- Scalar value is monitored (Overhauser, PPM)
- Sensor is rotated to cover all possible directions with respect to Earth's field vector
- Non-linear optimization (fitting) of the parameters (vector scalar value should match the scalar value measured with OVH)





### Calibrations at GFU facilities

- Long-term collaboration with IG CAS
- Vectorial calibrations
  - At Pruhonice ex-observatory.
    - Triaxial calibrating coils X CMI national flux density standard
    - Results > 400 ppm (gain) ambient noise (subway, railway).
    - Zikmund, Janosek et al., IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas. 2015
- Scalar calibrations
  - At BDV observatory
    - Homogeneity ~ 5nT/m in the absolute pavilion
    - 2 OVH scalar mags available @ BDV
    - Calibration during quiet periods BDV forecasts
    - Possibility of long-term on-site calibrations
    - Results : up to 10 ppm STDEV (gain)







### Scalar calibrations ctd.

- Residual obtained from the vectorial sensor triplet after calibration R= B<sub>OVH</sub> - |B<sub>VEC</sub>|
- The minimum obtained at BDV facility with our best sensors – vectorially compensated - was 0.2 - 0.3 nT<sub>rms</sub>
- This corresponds to uncertainty of estimation:
  - Gain factors ±10 ppm
  - Offsets ±1.5 nT offsets
  - Orthogonality ± 3 arc-sec
- Important for *moving sensor* applications
  - Mine hunting, archaelogy, geology mapping etc.
  - Much higher sample rates than with any OVH or PPM
- Non-INTERMAGNET repeat stations possibility to integrate variometer and total field measurement in one instrument.





# CTU variometer - long-term and noise measurements

- CTU variometer uses low-noise sensors and low noise offset feedback
  - Race-track sensors, 5 pT / √Hz @ 1 Hz
- 2 pcs installed at NOA Athens
- 1 piece test at IG CAS for a variation station
- BDV measurements:
  - Long-term measurement to prove stability of the sensors (offset and gain)
  - Noise measurement during night periods
    - Motivation: upcoming INTERMAGNET standard requiring low noise instruments.
    - difficult to measure in shielded chambers size and offset field creation



### Noise measurement results



Even at BDV, ambient noise is lowest in the night.

2300-0345 CEST data used for noise evaluation of the variometer

0.1Hz ~ 20pT/ $\sqrt{Hz}$ 1Hz ~ 6pT/ $\sqrt{Hz}$ 

Foreseen Intermagnet standard - 0.1Hz - 10pT/√Hz

Make more measurements or move to a large shielded room (PTB Berlin)

### Variometer long-term stability

- December 2015, 16 days burn-in, no temperature control (unheated absolute building)
- Calculated total (blue) compared to observatory devices: GDAS (red), CANMOS (black)
- Differences from OVH PPM readings plotted:

Burn-in of feedback sense resistors during first 10 days

Lower noise than CANMOS, far better than GDAS.



## APMP Overhauser magnetometer comparison

- 2014, Metrological task led by VNIIM, St. Petersburg
- 10 Metrology and Geophysical institutes over the world
- Motivation estimate the uncertainty achievable with widely used Overhauser PPM magnetometers
  - VNIIM facility with He-Cs MFD standard, 0.3-1 ppm STDEV
  - VNIIM provided a travel standard to be checked at Earth's field levels
- IG CAS, CTU and Czech Metrological Institute participated together
  - Earth's field with low magnetic gradient and disturbances
  - 2 OVH PPM's (GEM GSM-19) from CTU and IG

### The comparison procedure



- The 3 instruments swapped : B x D (magnetic gradient ~ 6 nT)
- Total field logged (instrument time synchronized)
- Equation with MFD gradient, instrument difference and "true field"
- Mutual differences + standard deviation were established
  - Ulvr, Zikmund, Kupec et al., Journal of Elec. Eng. 2015

### The procedure contd.



### **Comparison results**

 $\Delta_{CTU-VNIIM} = (-0.17 \pm 0.36) \text{ nT}$  $\Delta_{IGCAS-VNIIM} = (-0.47 \pm 0.36) \text{ nT}$  $\Delta_{CTU-IGCAS} = (0.30 \pm 0.36) \text{ nT}$ 

The results are third best in among the participants as for the uncertainty and estimated value.

(after VNIIM and RMI - Dourbes with *He/Cs or potassium-magnetometer closed-loop coil system*)



## Summary

- The BDV observatory and the facilities find intensive use during research tasks performed by CTU and IG CAS
- The results achieved are quite encouraging
- I really appreciate our good relationships and look forward for more nice results published together <sup>(2)</sup>

### Thank you for your attention.