

Intercomparison Between CENAM¹, BIPM² And Troemner³ to Determine the Volume Magnetic Susceptibility of a 100 g Weight

J Nava¹, R S Davis² and J Moran³

¹Centro Nacional de Metrología, CENAM, Mexico.

²Bureau International des Poids et Mesures, BIPM, Sèvres, France.

³Accredited Laboratory by NVLAP, USA.

Abstract. Magnetic interactions may lead to errors in mass measurements of high accuracy. Requirements of magnetic susceptibility and permanent magnetization on the mass standards (weights) have been included in the new draft of OIML R111. Measurement methods and instruments for characterizing these magnetic properties of the weights have been developed as well. The BIPM susceptometer has been adopted by a number of primary laboratories with responsibility for mass standards. We report a comparison of susceptibility results by three different laboratories using this instrument.

1. Introduction

The BIPM Susceptometer has been adopted by a number of primary laboratories that they have the responsibility of the mass standards of high accuracy. The new draft OIML R111 has included new requirements on volume magnetic susceptibility and permanent magnetization [1] for mass standards (weights). Volume magnetic susceptibility can be measured quantitatively using the BIPM susceptometer and permanent magnetization can be detected.

Normally, the weighing of a body using a weighing instrument is based on the gravitational force on the body. However, the presence of the magnetic forces due to magnetic properties of the body and also from the ambient magnetic field generated by the weighing instrument (electrical circuits, coils and permanent magnets) should not be ignored[3].

The aim of this comparison is to check the use of the susceptometer described in [2] to determine the volume magnetic susceptibility of a Class E₂ 100 g standard.

The test procedure that CENAM, BIPM and TROEMNER used is proposed in [2] and is similar to that described in [1].

2. Weight

One 100 g weight, manufactured by TROEMNER, was used in this comparison. The weight complies with the OIML R111 requirements [4].

The weight dimensions were given directly by TROEMNER and were checked by the others two participants.

3.- Model for Magnetic Errors in Mass Metrology

The z-component of a force on a sample with a magnetic susceptibility χ and magnetization M in a magnetic field is obtained from:

$$F_z = -\frac{\mu_0}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \int (\chi H * H) dV - \mu_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \int (M * H) dV \quad (1)$$

Where χ is the volume magnetic susceptibility of the standard, M is its permanent magnetization (defined as the magnetic moment per unit volume in zero field), H is the local magnetic field strength and the z-axis is parallel to the gravitational acceleration, g [2]. The integrals are taken over the volume of the sample.

4.- BIPM susceptometer

CENAM, BIPM and TROEMNER used the susceptometer described in [2], the difference was the weighing instrument adopted at the susceptometer, such characteristics are describe in the following Table 1:

Table 1. Weighing instrument characteristics adopted at the susceptometer:

Institute	Weighing instrument
CENAM	MX 5 $d= 0,001$ mg
BIPM	UMT 5 $d= 0,000 1$ mg
TROEMNER	UMT 5 $d= 0,000 1$ mg

Figure 1 shows the apparatus schematically, the design details also are described in [2].




Fig.1 View of the apparatus. A small rare-earth magnet is placed on a supporting column, which is on the pan balance. A nonmagnetic bridge, the height of which may be increased using blocks, spans the weighing chamber. The body (weight) is placed on the bridge.

5. Traceability

CENAM determined the distance between the magnet and the bridge (Z_0) [2] by using two different methods; one method was using a reference standard of magnetic susceptibility whose value was determined by the BIPM. and the second method was using a set of gauge blocks and LVDT probe head these are traceable to the National Length Laboratory in Mexico. Balance readings are traceable to National Mass Laboratory (CENAM). The magnet was calibrated at the BIPM. The dimensions (for the geometry correction) of the weights were given by TROEMNER.


BIPM determined the distance Z_0 [2] by using a reference standard of magnetic susceptibility whose value was determined by the BIPM with respect to calibrated susceptibility standards obtained from a number of national measurement institutes. Balance readings are traceable to Mass Section of the BIPM. The magnet was calibrated at the BIPM [2,6]. The dimensions (for the geometry correction) of the weights were given by TROEMNER.

TROEMNER determined the distance Z_0 [2] by using a reference standard of magnetic susceptibility whose value was determined by the BIPM. Balance readings are traceable to National Mass Laboratory (NIST). The magnet was calibrated at the BIPM. The dimensions (for the geometry correction) of the weights were given by TROEMNER.

6. Measurements.

The measurements were carried out as follows:

The measurements were carried out by TROEMNER at March 2001, CENAM in April 2001 and the last measurements the BIPM in May 2001.



7. Results

The results of the comparison are presented in the following Table 2:

Table 2. Results of the comparison

TROEMNER	
Magnetic susceptibility χ	0,003 0
U_χ	0,000 6
Magnetic flux density (max.)	0,8 mT
Z_0	27,71 mm
CENAM	
Magnetic susceptibility χ	0,003 1
U_χ	0,000 6
Magnetic flux density (max.)	1,4 mT
Z_0	22,16 mm
BIPM	
Magnetic susceptibility χ	0,003 1
U_χ	0,000 3
Magnetic flux density (max.)	0,9 mT
Z_0	26,64 mm

As seen from Table 2, the sample was exposed to a flux density of less than 1,5 mT in all cases.

8.- Uncertainty

The propagation of uncertainty from various sources is given in the following Table 3, where $u_r(x)$ represents the relative standard uncertainty of a parameter x :

Table 3. Relative standard uncertainties of a parameter x

Source of Uncertainty	Contribution to $u_r(\chi)$
$u_r(m_a)$	$u_r(m_a)$
$u_r(m_a(s))$	$\left[1 + \frac{Y_f}{2}\right] u_r(m_a(s))$
$u_r(m)$	$Y_f u_r(m)$
$u_r(\chi_s)$	$\left[1 + \frac{Y_f}{2}\right] u_r(\chi_s)$

Where $m_a(s)*g = F_a(s)$, g is the local acceleration of gravity and $F_a(s)$ is the force between the magnet and the standard. Thus $m_a(s)$ is the average balance reading found when measuring the standard and m_a is the corresponding value of the unknown, m is the magnetic moment of the magnet, and χ_s is the magnetic susceptibility of the standard Y_f , which is approximately 0,5 for these measurements, takes account of correlations between Z_0 , m , and χ_s [6]. An Additional component of the uncertainty is due to approximating the OIML shape in order to calculate the geometry factor [2]. An additional component of the uncertainty is due to approximating the OIML shape in order to calculate the geometry factor [2].

The E_n values are presented in Table 4 in order to quantify the degree of agreement [5] between the participants

Table 4. The E_n values are presented in this table

	E_n
BIPM-CENAM	0
BIPM-TROEMNER	0,14
CENAM-TROEMNER	0,12

$$|E_n| \leq 1$$

The degree of agreement among the participants is seen to be excellent. In other words the reproducibility of susceptibility measurements made with the BIPM susceptometer is excellent. Similar agreement has also been obtained in another recent comparison [7].

9. Conclusions

The new magnetic susceptibility and permanent magnetization requirements that have been proposed [1,3] recognize that magnetic interactions are among the most important influence factors to be considered in mass determinations. We have shown that reproducible measurements of the susceptibility of a 100 g OIML-shaped standard can be obtained using the BIPM susceptometer.

10 References

- [1] Draft OIML R111 Weights of classes E₁, E₂, F₁, F₂, M₁, M₂, M₃ (including weights for testing of high capacity weighing machines) Part 1: Metrological and Technical Requirements February 2000.
- [2] Davis, R.S. “Determining the Magnetic Properties of 1 kg Mass Standards” J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stands. Technol. (USA), 100, 209-25, May-June 1995.
- [3] Gläser, M. “Magnetic Interactions between weights and weighing instruments”, Meas. Sci. Technol. 12 (2001) 709-715.
- [2] OIML R111 Weights of classes E₁, E₂, F₁, F₂, M₁, M₂, M₃ Edition 1994.
- [5] W. Wöger, “Remarks on the E_n -criterion Used in Measurement Comparison, Internationale Zusammenarbeit.PTB-Mitteilungen 1999. Pages 24-27.
- [6] Chung J.W., Ryu K.S., Davis R.S., “Uncertainty analysis of the BIPM susceptometer”, Metrologia 38 (2001) 535-541.
- [7] Davis R.S., Gläser M, Heierli R., Pendrill L.R. and Richard Ph. “Intercomparison of Magnetic Properties of Mass Standards”, Proceedings of the 10th International Metrology Conference, St. Louis (France), October 2001.