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### ATHENA
Advanced Telescope for High-ENergy Astrophysics
Spatially-resolved X-ray spectroscopy and deep, wide-field X-ray spectral imaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cosmic Vision Themes</th>
<th>The Hot and Energetic Universe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary goals</td>
<td>Mapping hot gas structures and determining their physical properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Searching for supermassive black holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbit</td>
<td>Halo orbit around L2, the second Lagrange point of the Sun-Earth system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>Five years, with possible five-year extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>L-class mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Silicon Pore Optics (SPO) telescope with a focal length of 12 m and 2 m$^2$ effective area at 1 keV
- X-ray Integral Field Unit (X-IFU) for high-spectral resolution imaging
- Wide Field Imager (WFI) for high count rate, moderate resolution spectroscopy over a large field of view
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Enabling technology/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Area</td>
<td>2 m² @ 1 keV (goal 2.5 m²) 0.25 m² @ 6 keV (goal 0.3 m²)</td>
<td>Silicon Pore Optics developed by ESA. Single telescope: 3 m outer diameter, 12 m fixed focal length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angular Resolution</td>
<td>5'' (goal 3'') on-axis 10'' at 25'' radius</td>
<td>Detailed analysis of error budget confirms that a performance of 5'' HEW is feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Range</td>
<td>0.3-12 keV</td>
<td>Grazing incidence optics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Field of View</td>
<td>Wide-Field Imager: (WFI): 40' (goal 50') X-ray Integral Field Unit: (X-IFU): 5' (goal 7')</td>
<td>Large area DEPFET Active Pixel Sensors. Large array of multiplexed Transition Edge Sensors (TES) with 250 μm pixels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectral Resolution</td>
<td>WFI: &lt; 150 eV @ 6 keV</td>
<td>Large area DEPFET Active Pixel Sensors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-IFU: 2.5 eV @ 6 keV (goal 1.5 eV @ 1 keV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Rate Capability</td>
<td>&gt; 1 Crab (WFI)</td>
<td>Fast Detector for high count rates without pile-up and with micro-second time resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 mCrab, point source (X-IFU) 1 Crab (30% throughput)</td>
<td>Filters and beam diffuser enable higher count rate capability with reduced spectral resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOO Response</td>
<td>4 hours (goal 2 hours) for 50% of time</td>
<td>Slew times &lt; 2 hours feasible; total response time dependent on ground system issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Barret et al., 2013, SF2A-2013, 447)
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Primarily still ground-based plan.
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Silicon Pore Optics technology

Developed by ESA and Cosine Measurement System (cosine.nl) over the last decade.
SPO terminology

SPO mirror stack (35 plates)

Mirror Module (MM)

Mirror Assembly Module (MAM)

~$10^3$ MMs

3m Diameter!

Courtesy M.Bavdaz (ESA/ESTEC)
Telescope calibration requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Total value</th>
<th>MAM value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal length (on-ground)</td>
<td>10 mm</td>
<td>10 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal length (in-flight)</td>
<td>1 mm</td>
<td>1 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platescale</td>
<td>0.2”</td>
<td>0.2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical axis (w.r.t. MA_PCS)</td>
<td>30”</td>
<td>30”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical axis (w.r.t. sc_PCS)</td>
<td>30”</td>
<td>30”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF HEW</td>
<td>2/2/10%</td>
<td>2/2/10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF 2-D shape</td>
<td>10”/2%</td>
<td>10”/2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute effective area on-axis</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute effective area off-axis</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative effective area on-axis</td>
<td>5% (X-IFU)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% (WFI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative effective area off-axis</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative effective area, fine structure</td>
<td>1%+TBD</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area stability with time (pre-launch)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area stability with time (post-launch)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray light</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Preliminary ...**
- ... but already intensively discussed!
- Stemming from the Science Requirement (Document) + Mission Budget (Document)
- Under review by the A. Science Study Team, the Telescope Working Group, and the Instrument Teams
- Aiming at a consolidated version by the Preliminary Requirements Review (≥Nov 2017)
Telescope calibration: assumptions

- A physical model of the telescope plays a crucial role, based on a common open-access database and validated by experimental data
- No resources available to cover the whole calibration parameter space for each and all MMUs – multi-tier, flexible approach required
- [implying careful control on the performance homogeneity, and the sub-sample properties vis-à-vis the parent sample]
- Identify parameters to be calibrated on-ground (e.g., PSF large-scale 2-D structure) vs. in-flight (e.g., contamination)
Optics database

- Manufacturing data
- Synchrotron alignment
- Long beam tests (selected)
- MM verification tests (all)
- Proton scattering
- Long beam tests
- MM alignment data
- Structure measurements

- XOU model
- MM model
- MAM model

Mirror response generator
Calibration flow

- **Process steps**

- "**Bulk verification/calibration**" = on all or a substantial fraction of MMs

- "**Sub-assembly [detailed] calibration**" = on some elements per row (~a few MMs)

- **Integrated-MAM calibration** for science performance assessment
Recommendations: flow & facilities

- **MM assembly, alignment**: synchrotron facility (e.g., BessyII)

- **Fine structure**: long-baseline synchrotron beam with homogeneous full illumination with $\Delta E \leq 1$ eV resolution on $\sim 2$ plates/row at, e.g., C, B, Si, Ir

- **MM verification**: $A_{\text{eff}}$, PSF, and FL measurements at 2 E on all MMs at a dedicated facility with good collimation, $\sim 2$ MM/day rate, close to MM production and/or MAM integration sites

- **MM [detailed] calibration**: $A_{\text{eff}}$, vignetting, PSF (on-/off-axis) at 5-10 E on $\sim 4$ MMs/row at long beam facility (2MMs/row spare; 2MMs/row back to flow)

- **MAM calibration**: Full characterization of science performance ($A_{\text{eff}}$, PSF in-/out-focus, vignetting, straylight, at $\sim 2$-10 E) at a longer-beam facility with $\geq 90\%$ illumination (implying $\geq 800$ m)
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X-IFU is a very challenging instrument

- unprecedented energy resolution and large effective area requirements
  - $2.5 \text{ eV} \ [1-7 \text{ KeV}]$
  - $0.1 \text{ m}^2 \ [0.3 \text{ keV}], \ 1.5 \text{ m}^2 \ [1 \text{ keV}], \ 0.17 \text{ m}^2 \ [7 \text{ keV}]$
- 3840 micro-calorimeters
- cryogenic operations constraints

Detector assembly at 50 mK

X-IFU dewar
X-IFU calibration requirements

Energy scale:
- absolute: 0.4 eV [0.3 - 7keV]

Energy resolution (line spread function):
- energy resolution: 0.15 eV [0.3 - 7keV]

Effective area (QE)
- instrument QE: 4% [absolute, @1 keV]
- instrument QE: TBD% [relative over 0.5 - 10 keV]

Background
- non focused charged particle background: 2% TBC [100 ks, 9 arcmin², >1 keV]
- focused charged particle background: 10% TBC [100 ks, 9 arcmin², >1 keV]

Timing
- dead time knowledge (1%)
# X-IFU calibration strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Component level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy scale</td>
<td>✓ FPA + readout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy resolution</td>
<td>✓ detector array</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy redistribution</td>
<td>✓ detector array</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantum efficiency</td>
<td>✓ (final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detectors</td>
<td>✓ (final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filters/window contamination</td>
<td>✓ initial reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>irradiation TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straylight</td>
<td>FPA including CryoAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>✓ Readout, MXS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ means measurements on FM hardware (✓ when critical or final)

*Italics* indicates activities linked to AIT/AIV
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ATHENA WFI Calibration Plan: devices and facilities

- WFI DEPFET device
- with internal calibration source: conservative approach: based on Fe-55, with dedicated target material
- with external optics module: 2 scientific instruments in focal plane and one large optics module → tilted
- camera at PUMA facility at MPE
- optics samples (+ camera) at PANTER facility at MPE
- additional measurements at synchrotron facility (e.g., BESSY)
ATHENA WFI Calibration Plan: subjects

- Gain of each pixel of the detectors
- Spectral resolution and redistribution matrix
- Pattern fractions
- Quantum efficiency (incl. on-chip light-blocking filter)
- External filter transmission
- Spatial homogeneity
- Offset and noise maps
- Determination of internal (“Closed”) background
- Relative and absolute timing accuracy
- Spatial resolution (sub-pixel)
- Point-spread function and pile-up effects in camera
- beyond WFI: PSF as such, effective area, vignetting, stray-light, ...
- in-flight: CalPV, cross-calibration (X-IFU?), routine monitoring
Summary

- Athena Study Phase A ➔ achieve a consolidated set of calibration plans for the optics/instruments (requirement for PRR)
- Calibration requirements are in the definition phase
  - Ideally, based on “reverse engineering” the science requirements using extensive simulations (heritage of the Monte-Carlo perturbation approach discussed also at the IACHEC)
- We aim at a comprehensive ground-based calibration plan. How much we can afford is a potential issue – e.g., end-to-end test?
- Parallel effort to characterize the expected background conditions at L2 (vs. L1) is underway (see S.Molendi’s presentation at the CCD WG)
- “11 años no son nada”: now is the right time to bite the bullet!