

National Institute of Standards and Technology  
Time and Frequency Division  
Atomic Frequency Standards Group, M/S 847.5  
325 Broadway  
Boulder, CO, 80305 USA

Date: August 31, 2007

To: Dr. Felicitas Arias  
Time Section, BIPM  
FAX: 33 1 45 07 70 59  
Phone: 33 1 45 07 70 76

From: Dr. Thomas E. Parker  
FAX: 1 303 497 6461  
Phone: 1 303 497 7881

Dear Dr. Arias,

Attached is the report of our most recent formal evaluation of NIST-F1, a cesium fountain primary frequency standard. The report period is for the 25 day interval from MJD 54314 to 54339. However, the fountain was operated in a virtually continuous fashion over a shorter evaluation interval from MJD 54314.92 to 54338.97. Details of the standard's design, construction, and performance are presented in references 1 - 8 listed on page 8. A detailed summary of the present evaluation is included in this report. The evaluation results using the BIPM format are given on pages 2 and 7. There are no significant changes in NIST-F1 since the last report.

Thomas E. Parker  
Leader, Atomic Frequency Standards Group

## SUMMARY

### August 2007 Evaluation of NIST-F1

The most recent evaluation of NIST-F1 is reported. The number

$$Y_{(\text{NISTF1-maser})} = -305.53 \times 10^{-15}$$

is the average fractional frequency difference between NIST-F1 and the hydrogen maser ST0005, (clock # 40205) over the 25 day report period MJD 54314 to 54339. The type A uncertainty of the fountain for this evaluation (statistical confidence on the frequency measurement including a component due to spin exchange, but not including dead time) is  $0.26 \times 10^{-15}$  ( $1\sigma$ ). The type B uncertainty from known biases (not including spin exchange) is  $0.31 \times 10^{-15}$  ( $1\sigma$ ). The combined uncertainty (type A and type B) is  $0.40 \times 10^{-15}$  ( $1\sigma$ ). The uncertainty becomes  $0.41 \times 10^{-15}$  ( $1\sigma$ ) when the contribution from dead time,  $u_{\text{link/lab}}$ , is included. A detailed description of the various biases and uncertainties is given in the following sections of this report.

### RESULTS IN BIPM FORMAT

Report period		MJD 54314 to 54339
Maser frequency (ST0005), clock # 40205)		$Y_{(\text{NISTF1 - maser})} = -305.53 \times 10^{-15}$
Statistical	$u_A$	$0.26 \times 10^{-15}$
Systematic	$u_B$	$0.31 \times 10^{-15}$
Link to clock	$u_{\text{link/lab}}$ (25 days)	$0.06 \times 10^{-15}$
Link to TAI (estimated)	$u_{\text{link/TAI}}$ (25 days)	$0.38 \times 10^{-15}$
Combined (estimated)	$u$	$0.56 \times 10^{-15}$

## 1. DETAILS OF EVALUATION

An accuracy evaluation of NIST-F1 has been completed in which the frequency of a hydrogen maser was determined with respect to the primary frequency standard. The report period is 25 days, but the fountain was operated only over the 24.05 day evaluation interval of MJD 54314.92 to 54338.97. Of the 24.05 days intended for the measurement of the maser frequency, 23.59 days of data were collected (98.1% run time). The lost run time was from intentional interruptions to the fountain operation for routine maintenance. The percentage run time for the entire report period is 94.4%. A time line of the 25 day report period is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Time Line

MJD	Event
54314.00	Start report period
54314.92	Start fountain run, low density (8)
54326.83	End low density,
54326.98	Start high density (36)
54328.92	End high density (35.5)
54328.93	Start low density (8)
54338.97	End low density, end fountain run
54339.00	End report period

A factor of 4.5 in atom densities was covered in this evaluation and the frequency for zero density was obtained by a weighted linear least-mean-square fit [3]. The atom densities in laboratory units are shown in parentheses in Table 1. Other corrections are also made to the raw frequency data in order to compensate for known biases which are described below [2]. Units for all biases are fractional frequency  $\times 10^{-15}$  and all uncertainties are 1 sigma.

### A. Quadratic Zeeman Bias

The quadratic Zeeman bias was determined by measuring the linear Zeeman splitting of the microwave spectrum. The magnetic field was monitored during the entire run. No significant changes were made to the Zeeman bias since the last run. The resulting bias and uncertainty are shown below.

Bias	Type B Uncertainty
+180.64	0.013

## B. Spin Exchange Bias

Measurements were made over a range of atom densities. A factor of 4.5 in atom density was covered and the frequency at zero density was obtained from the zero density intercept of a weighted linear least-mean-square fit of frequency versus atom density [3]. Twenty four data points (each nominally 24 hours) were used in the fit and a reduced chi squared of 0.77 was obtained. This corresponds to a Birge ratio of 0.88. As in the last three reports it was decided to adjust the uncertainty attributed to the spin exchange bias by this Birge ratio [3]. By using a range of atom densities there is no fixed spin exchange bias, however the bias in fractional frequency from the lowest measured density to zero density was  $-0.50 \times 10^{-15}$  with an uncertainty of  $0.16 \times 10^{-15}$ . These values are shown below for informational purposes only. They are not included in the total of the type B biases and uncertainties of Table 2 since they are already incorporated into the intercept and its uncertainty (type A uncertainty). Note that 92% of the fountain run time was at the lowest atom density.

Bias	Type B Uncertainty
(-0.50)	(0.16)

## C. Blackbody Bias

The blackbody bias is calculated from the temperature of the drift region. The resulting bias and its uncertainty are shown below.

Bias	Type B Uncertainty
-22.84	0.28

## D. Microwave Amplitude Shift

A few additional measurements on the microwave amplitude dependence were made so the bias and uncertainty have changed a small amount. The observed bias is consistent with zero, but we have chosen to include it in the list of corrected biases.

Bias	Type B Uncertainty
-0.026	0.12

## E. Combined variable and fixed biases

There are additional biases that do not change under normal circumstances. The complete list of all biases (run dependent and fixed) and their corresponding uncertainties are shown in Table 2. This table is based on [2]. Only the first 4 biases are explicitly corrected for since the rest are all well under  $1 \times 10^{-16}$ . **The maximum magnitudes of all uncorrected biases are indicated in blue.** The spin exchange bias is not corrected in the same manner as the others since it is included in the intercept of the weighted least-mean-square fit of frequency versus atom density.

Table 2: Known Frequency Biases and Their Type B Uncertainty.  
(Units are fractional frequency  $\times 10^{-15}$ )

Physical Effect	Bias	Type B Uncertainty
Gravitational Red shift	+179.95	0.03
Second-Order Zeeman	+180.64	0.013
Blackbody	-22.84	0.28
Microwave Amplitude Shift	-0.026	0.12
Spin Exchange (low density)	(-0.50)*	(0.16)*
AC Zeeman (heaters)	0.05	0.05
Cavity Pulling	0.02	0.02
Rabi Pulling	$10^{-4}$	$10^{-4}$
Ramsey Pulling	$10^{-4}$	$10^{-4}$
Majorana Transitions	0.02	0.02
Fluorescence Light Shift	$10^{-5}$	$10^{-5}$
Cavity Phase (distributed)	0.02	0.02
Second-Order Doppler	0.02	0.02
DC Stark Effect	0.02	0.02
Background Gas Collisions	$10^{-3}$	$10^{-3}$
Bloch-Siegert	$10^{-4}$	$10^{-4}$
RF Spectral purity	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$
Integrator offset	0	0.01
Total Type B Standard Uncertainty		0.31

\*For information purposes only. Not used in total, see section 1-B for details

## 2. EVALUATION INTERVAL RESULTS (MJD 54314.92 to 54338.97)

When corrections for the biases of Table 2 are applied, the following result for the measurement of  $Y_{(\text{NISTF1-maser})}$  is obtained. Because the type A uncertainty includes the spin-exchange bias uncertainty, we include (in parentheses in the table below) the combined statistical uncertainty of all the data collected in this evaluation (as if there were no need for a linear fit). This is included only for its informational value. Units are fractional frequency  $\times 10^{-15}$ .

Corrected Frequency	Type A Uncertainty - includes spin exchange	Total Type B Uncertainty - does not include spin exchange	Combined Uncertainty
-305.53	0.26 (0.16)	0.31	0.40

## 3. INFLUENCE OF DEAD TIME

NIST-F1 was operated for a total of only 23.59 days during this 25 day report period so the dead time has a very small impact on the overall uncertainty. However, NIST has a well characterized ensemble of hydrogen masers so this impact can be quantified. The frequency stability and drift of the reference maser are well known. No drift correction was required because the frequency drift on this maser is very small and there was relative little dead time. However, the dead time contributes an additional type A uncertainty of  $0.06 \times 10^{-15}$ . See references 10 - 13. A new procedure was used to handle distributed dead time [13]. This results in an improved estimate of the dead time uncertainty.

#### 4. FINAL REPORT PERIOD RESULTS (without time transfer uncertainty)

Applying the correction resulting from dead time to the evaluation interval results yields the following 25 day final report period results.

Report period	MJD 54314 to 54339
Maser frequency (ST0005, clock # 40205)	$Y_{(\text{NISTF1} - \text{maser})} = -305.53 \times 10^{-15}$
Type A uncertainty (not including dead time)	$0.26 \times 10^{-15} (1\sigma)$
Type B uncertainty	$0.31 \times 10^{-15} (1\sigma)$
Combined uncertainty (fountain only)	$0.40 \times 10^{-15} (1\sigma)$ .
Type A uncertainty from dead time	$0.06 \times 10^{-15} (1\sigma)$
Combined uncertainty with dead time	$0.41 \times 10^{-15} (1\sigma)$ .

#### 5. FINAL RESULTS USING BIPM FORMAT (includes time transfer uncertainty)

Report period	MJD 54314 to 54339
Maser frequency (ST0005), clock # 40205)	$Y_{(\text{NISTF1} - \text{maser})} = -305.53 \times 10^{-15}$
Statistical $u_A$	$0.26 \times 10^{-15}$
Systematic $u_B$	$0.31 \times 10^{-15}$
Link to clock $u_{\text{link/lab}} (25 \text{ days})$	$0.06 \times 10^{-15}$
Link to TAI (estimated) $u_{\text{link/TAI}} (25 \text{ days})$	$0.38 \times 10^{-15}$
Combined (estimated) $u$	$0.56 \times 10^{-15}$

## 6. REFERENCES

1. S.R. Jefferts, J. Shirley, T. E. Parker, T.P. Heavner, D.M. Meekhof, C. Nelson, F. Levi, G. Costanzo, A. DeMarchi, R. Drullinger, L. Hollberg, W.D. Lee and F.L. Walls, "Accuracy Evaluation of NIST-F1," *Metrologia*, vol. 39, pp 321-336, 2002.
2. T.P. Heavner, S.R. Jefferts, E.A. Donley, J.H. Shirley, and T.E. Parker, "NIST-F1: Recent Improvements and Accuracy Evaluations," *Metrologia*, vol. 42, pp 411-422, 2005.
3. T.E. Parker, S.R. Jefferts, T.P. Heavner, and E.A. Donley, "Operation of the NIST-F1 Caesium Fountain Primary Frequency Standard with a Maser Ensemble, Including the Impact of Frequency Transfer Noise," *Metrologia*, vol. 42, pp 423-430, 2005.
4. J.H. Shirley, F. Levi, T.P. Heavner, D. Calonico, D. Yu and S.R. Jefferts, "Microwave Leakage Induced Frequency Shifts in the Primary Frequency Standards NIST-F1 and IEN-CSF1," *IEEE Trans. on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control*, vol. 53, pp. 2376-2385, 2006.
5. S.R. Jefferts, J.H. Shirley, N. Ashby, E.A. Burt, and G.J. Dick, "Power Dependence of Distributed Cavity Phase-Induced Frequency Biases in Atomic Fountain Frequency Standards," *IEEE Trans. on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control*, vol. 52, pp 2314-2321, 2004
6. S.R. Jefferts, T.P. Heavner, E.A. Donley and T.E. Parker, "Measurement of Dynamic End-to-End Cavity Phase Shifts in Cesium-Fountain Frequency Standards," *IEEE Trans. on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control*, vol. 51, pp 652-653, 2005.
7. T.P. Heavner, J.H. Shirley, F. Levi, D. Yu, and S.R. Jefferts, "Frequency Biases in Pulsed Atomic Fountain Frequency Standards Due to Spurious Components in the Microwave Spectrum," in *Proc. 2006 IEEE International Freq. Control Symp.*, pp 273-276, 2006.
8. S.R. Jefferts, R.E Drullinger, A. DeMarchi, "NIST Cesium Fountain Microwave Cavities," in *Proc. 1998 IEEE International Freq. Control Symp.*, pp 6-8, 1998.
9. N. K. Pavlis and M. Weiss, "The Relativistic Redshift with  $3 \times 10^{-17}$  Uncertainty at NIST, Boulder, Colorado, USA," *Metrologia*, vol. 40, pp 66-73, 2003.
10. T.E. Parker, "Hydrogen Maser Ensemble Performance and Characterization of Frequency Standards," in *Proc. 1999 Joint Meeting of European Freq. and Time Forum and IEEE International Freq. Control Symp.*, pp 173-176, 1999.
11. T.E. Parker, D.A. Howe and M. Weiss, "Accurate Frequency Comparisons at the  $1 \times 10^{-15}$  Level," in *Proc. 1998 IEEE International Freq. Control Symp.*, pp 265-272, 1998.
12. R.J. Douglas and J.S. Boulanger, "Standard Uncertainty for Average Frequency Traceability," in *Proc. 11<sup>th</sup> European Freq. and Time Forum.*, pp 345-349, 1997.
13. Dai-Hyuk Yu, Marc Weiss and Thomas E. Parker, "Uncertainty of a Frequency Comparison with Distributed Dead Time and Measurement Interval Offset," *Metrologia*, vol. 44, pp 91-96, 2007.



## Appendix A

### Summary of accumulated changes in biases and uncertainties since the state of NIST-F1 discussed in references 2 and 3

- (1) 30 day evaluation of June/July 2005 (MJD 53529-53559)  
Modifications to the optical detection electronics and the low noise quartz oscillator improved the stability ( $u_A$ ) of NIST-F1. More measurements with respect to microwave leakage reduced this uncertainty from  $2 \times 10^{-16}$  to  $1.4 \times 10^{-16}$ .
- (2) 40 day evaluation of September/October 2005 (MJD 53629-53669)  
A magnetic field monitor was added to NIST-F1. No change was needed in the second order Zeeman bias uncertainty. Also, no other Type B uncertainties have been changed.
- (3) 40 day evaluation of December 2005/January 2006 (MJD 53724-53764)  
The fountain cycle time was shortened a bit and this resulted in a small improvement in short-term stability. Also the magnetic field uniformity was improved by shield degaussing and shimming, and this resulted in a small decrease in the Zeeman bias. There were no changes in the Type B uncertainties.
- (4) 40 day evaluation of February/March 2006 (MJD 53784-53824)  
No significant changes were made to NIST-F1 other than a slight increase in the average atom density. There were no changes in the Type B uncertainties.
- (5) 30 day evaluation of October 2006 (MJD 54009-54039)  
NIST-F1 was moved to a room with better environmental control and which is closer to the hydrogen masers and the time scale (shorter cables). The fountain was damaged in the move and as a result the microwave cavities, drift tube, and source region were replaced with nearly identical parts. All of the replaced parts are functionally the same as the originals. Because of the change in location and the repairs, the Zeeman and blackbody corrections are slightly larger, along with their uncertainties. The gravitational red shift is slightly smaller due primarily to the fact the fountain is now one floor lower than before, but there is no change in uncertainty. The bias and uncertainty for microwave leakage below the cavities are slightly larger.
- (6) 20 day evaluation of February 2007 (MJD 54134-54154)  
No significant changes were made to NIST-F1 for this evaluation, except that the magnetic field above the Ramsey cavity was increased by a factor of 2 in order to improve the field uniformity and decrease the possible effects of off resonant transitions. As an indirect result of these changes the atom cloud was slightly larger and probably colder. This resulted in a higher atom number at the lowest density used and consequently an improved short-term stability. Also additional microwave amplitude measurements were made to reduce the uncertainty on the microwave amplitude shift. This resulted in a slight decrease in the overall Type B uncertainty.
- (7) 15 day evaluation of April 2007 (MJD 54204-54219)

No significant changes were made to NIST-F1 since the February 2007 evaluation.

(8) 15 day evaluation of May 2007 (MJD 54219-54234)

No changes were made to NIST-F1 since the April 2007 evaluation.

(9) 25 day evaluation of August 2007 (MJD 54314-54339)

No changes were made to NIST-F1 since the May 2007 evaluation other than additional microwave power measurements which resulted in a slight decrease in the Type B uncertainty.